



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,947	05/25/2001	Mikko J Rinne	P278096	9586
909	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			MEW, KEVIN D	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/806,947

Applicant(s)

RINNE, MIKKO J

Examiner

Kevin Mew

Art Unit

2616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection:

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

SEEMA S. RAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Seema S. Rao
5/29/06

Applicant argued on page 3, fifth paragraph of the Remarks that the Kudoh (USP 5,414,702) reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the recited claim limitations of "the lower layer protocol data units containing two or more data segments" in line 6 of claim 1, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Fig. 3 of the Kudoh reference clearly shows a plurality of lower layer protocol data units (each lower layer protocol SAR-PDU data unit comprises SARH, SAR-PDU payload segment, and SART) contains a plurality of data segments called SAR-PDU payload segments, which reads on the claimed limitations recited in claim 1.

Applicant also argued on page 3, third paragraph of the Remarks that the length information LI disclosed in col. 3, lines 51-67 of Kudoh fails to teach the special information about higher level protocol data units using predetermined values of segmentation length information. However, it is noted that the length information LI is being used to address claim limitations in lines 6-7 of claim 1, rather than the "special information about the higher level protocol data units ..." as recited in lines 8-10 of claim 1.

Furthermore, the claimed language in lines 8-10 of claim 1 recites "indicating with predetermined values of the segmentation length information, special information about the higher level protocol data units ...," rather than a more straightforward language of "segmentation length information is used to ... indicate information about higher level protocol data units" as shown in fourth paragraph of applicant's Remarks. As a result, the SARH and SART disclosed in col. 3, lines 65-67 of Kudoh, which contain information necessary for assembling into the CS sublayer protocol data unit CS-PDU, are the special information being used to indicate information about higher level protocol data units CS-PDU.

Applicant also argued on page 3, first paragraph that Kudoh fails to teach or suggest the lower protocol data units containing two or more data segments, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is again shown in Fig. 3 of Kudoh that there are a plurality of lower layer protocol data units (each lower layer protocol SAR-PDU data unit comprises SARH, SAR-PDU payload segment, and SART) contains a plurality of data segments called SAR-PDU payload segments.

In Fig. 3, Kudoh shows a plurality of lower layer protocol SAR-PDU data units, each lower layer protocol SAR-PDU data unit comprises one SAR-PDU payload segment containing data from an upper layer CS-PDU. Therefore, it reads on the claimed limitations "each lower layer protocol unit includes one or more data segments each containing data from a different one of the upper layer data units" as recited in lines 4-5 of claim 1. Fig. 3 is just one CS-PDU unit that is segmented into a plurality of SAR-PDU data units. It is well known in the art the CS sublayer comprises more than one CS-PDU unit.